arXiv:1410.2495v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 9 Oct 2014

Reply to 'Comment on "Thermodynamics of quantum crystalline membranes"'

B. Amorim,[1,*] R. Roldán,[1,†] E. Cappelluti,[2] F. Guinea,[1] A. Fasolino,[3] and M. I. Katsnelson[3]

[1] *Instituto de Ciencia de Materiales de Madrid, CSIC, Cantoblanco E28049 Madrid, Spain*
[2] *Istituto dei Sistemi Complessi, CNR, U.O.S. Sapienza, v. dei Taurini 19, 00185 Roma, Italy*
[3] *Radboud University Nijmegen,Institute for Molecules and Materials, NL-6525AJ Nijmegen, The Netherlands*

(Dated: October 10, 2014)

In this note, we reply to the comment made by E.I.Kats and V.V.Lebedev [arXiv:1407.4298] on our recent work "Thermodynamics of quantum crystalline membranes" [Phys. Rev. B **89**, 224307 (2014)]. Kats and Lebedev question the validity of the calculation presented in our work, in particular on the use of a Debye momentum as a ultra-violet regulator for the theory. We address and counter argue the criticisms made by Kats and Lebedev to our work.

I. INTRODUCTION: SUMMARY OF OUR WORK AND MAIN CRITICISMS PRESENTED BY KATS AND LEBEDEV

We begin by briefly summarizing our recent work, Ref. 1. Our aim was to study the thermodynamic properties of crystalline membranes in the low temperature limit, where quantum effects dominate. In particular, our main goals were to determine the low temperature behavior of the thermal expansion and specific heat of a crystalline membrane, and to estimate the crossover temperature above which quantum effects are negligible and the classical theory can be safely used. In order to achieve that, our starting point was the standard, classical, anharmonic, continuous theory of crystalline membranes of Nelson & Peliti[2] (which is based on the same Hamiltonian as the usual plate theory[3]).

In the standard theory of membranes, the deviations of the point mass positions from the flat configuration are described in terms of an in-plane displacement, $\vec{u}$, and an out-of-plane displacement, h. In our theory (and in the standard classical theory[2]), there is a cubic interaction between the in-plane and out-of-plane displacements, of the generic form $\partial u(\partial h)^2$, and a quartic interaction involving only the out-of-plane displacement, of the form $(\partial h)^4$, see Figure 1.

We have quantized this classical theory by using the Feynman path integral formalism in imaginary time. By integrating out the in-plane displacements, we obtain an effective action for the out-of-plane displacement. By computing, to first order in perturbation theory, the self-energy for the out-of-plane displacement we obtained, in the long-wavelength limit, a contribution that goes as k^2 (k is the momentum). It is important to notice that the bare action does not contain such term, but only a k^4 term (associated with a bending energy). We emphasize that the k^2 contribution to the self-energy is only obtained if effects of retardation of the in-plane phonon in the interactions $\partial u(\partial h)^2$ are taken into account.

In order to perform the calculation, we have regularized the theory by adding a high momentum cutoff, above which the continuum theory we are employing breaks down. We made a "natural" identification of this cutoff as the Debye momentum, $q_D \sim 1/a$ where a is the lattice spacing of the crystalline membrane.

The criticism expressed by Kats and Lebedev in Ref. 4 (which had already been made in Ref. 5) goes along two main lines:

(a) such a k^2 contribution is a tension term and therefore should be zero for a free membrane;

(b) it is the use of the "natural" cutoff that leads us to this (in the point of view of Kats and Lebedev) wrong term.

The remaining of this note will be organized as follows. In Section II, we will answer to the criticism made by Kats and Lebedev in Ref. 4. We will argue that the k^2 contribution is not in reality a tension, but instead a renormalization of the bending rigidity of the membrane, that acquires a non-trivial momentum dependence. This is essentially the same situation as in the classical theory[2]. We will also argue that the use of the "natural" cutoff, although only an approximation, allows us to take into account the contribution of modes in the whole Brillouin zone of the crystalline membrane at a level that is sufficient for the tasks we set ourselves to accomplish in our work. In Section III, we will briefly discuss and compare the work by Kats and Lebedev Phys. Rev. B **89**, 125433 (2014), Ref. 5, also on the problem of quantum crystalline membranes, with ours. It is not the purpose of this note to make a criticism or a detailed analysis of Ref. 5. However, since the results presented there seem to be at odds with the results presented by us in Ref. 1, we believe the reader will benefit from such discussion.

II. ANSWER TO THE CRITICISMS

A. On the use of a "natural" cutoff

Let us first analyze the last point (b). Kats and Lebedev argue that from a renormalization group point of view, any high momentum divergence that appears in the calculation of some physical quantity, should be absorbed into a redefinition of the bare parameters of the action. The exact prescription in which these redefinitions should



FIG. 1. Diagrammatic representation of the interaction terms in the standard theory for crystalline membranes. Straight lines represent the out-of-plane propagator, wiggly lines represent the in-plane propagator. The dashed line represents the quartic interaction for the out-of-plane mode.

be performed are usually referred to as renormalization conditions. For this particular case, Kats and Lebedev argue the renormalization condition is that the membrane should be under zero tension, that is the k^2 term that we obtained should be canceled by adding a similar extra term in the bare action.

First of all, we would like to comment that this general regularization and renormalization procedure can only be performed for a limited number of theories, which are referred to as renormalizable. Renormalizability is a very desirable property of a field theory, since for such theories, once a finite number of parameters are determined by experiments, all other quantities can be unambiguously computed. In this sense, renormalizable theories have predictive power. It is generally postulated, that fundamental theories of nature should be renormalizable.

In condensed matter, continuum field theories usually arise as long-wavelength approximations to a more fundamental and complete theory that is generally known. Since the more complete theory is known, we also know the range of validity of the field theory. In general, the field theory will only be valid for momenta smaller than $\sim 1/a$, where a is a lattice spacing. If one is lucky, the obtained continuum field theory is renormalizable, and one can use the well known machinery of renormalization to study it. However, nothing ensures that the continuum field theory will be renormalizable, and very often, it is not.

Even if it turns out that the long-wavelength field theory is non-renormalizable, that does not mean that it is useless. Long-wavelength, continuous field theories can still be useful in order to study effects which would be computationally intractable if one were to use a more complete theory (such as an atomistic model or an *ab initio* method). In this situation, the parameters to be used in the bare action of the field theory are to be fed from the calculations using the more complete theory (in a certain approximation which does not capture the effect we are interested in). Then we use the field theory in order to study such effects. While using the field theory, one will be generally faced with divergent contributions due to high momentum. This just means that modes with all momenta (modes over all the Brillouin zone) will contribute to a given quantity. Although the field theory is, strictly speaking, not valid at high momenta, the contribution from high momentum modes can be estimated using a high momentum cutoff of the order of $\sim 1/a$, the Debye momentum.

This last approach, is the approach we employ in our work Ref. 1. For the bare parameters of our model, we use values obtained using an atomistic, classical model[6,7]. Then, we use a continuous field theory in order to study the effects of quantum fluctuations (which are not taken into account in the classical model) and long wavelength fluctuations in the thermodynamic limit (the atomistic model is limited to study finite size systems).

B. On the obtention of a k^2 contribution

Now, let us analyze the point (a). First, we would like to point out that the k^2 contribution to the out-of-plane mode self-energy that was found in our calculation is not a tension. Although we state in our paper

> "The present result of $\eta = 2$ indicates that quantum anharmonic effects act as an effective positive external strain, which contributes to the stabilization of the 2D phase of the membrane (see also Ref. 32)."

the view of the k^2 term as a tension/strain is to be understood only as an analogy (since a tension always gives origin to a k^2 contribution). As a matter of fact, the k^2 behaviour is somewhat of a coincidence. In general, and as stated in our paper, we will obtain a $k^{4-\eta}$ behaviour for the self-energy. This just means that the bending rigidity of the membrane will acquire a dependence on momentum $\kappa(k) \sim k^{-\eta}$, where η is some characteristic exponent. It is only at the level we solved the theory (first order perturbation theory and self-consistent calculation neglecting corrections to the in-plane correlators) that the $\eta = 2$ is obtained in the quantum problem at zero temperature. As we say in Ref. 1, for a more complete calculation we expect the value of η to be changed to a some other value different, but close, to 2.

It is worthwhile comparing our results with the results obtained in the classical theory for crystalline membranes. We start noting that, by taking the classical limit (formally setting all Matsubara frequencies to zero) of the effective action for our quantum theory (equation 13 of Ref. 1), one obtains the classical action from the paper by Nelson & Peliti, Ref. 2. If one starts from this classical action and performs a first order calculation for the

out-of-plane self-energy, one obtains[2,8]

$$\Sigma_k = \frac{4\mu(\lambda+\mu)}{\lambda+2\mu} k_B T \int \frac{d^2q}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{\left[\vec{k}\times\vec{q}\right]^4}{q^4} \frac{1}{\kappa\left|\vec{k}+\vec{q}\right|^2}$$
$$= \frac{4\mu(\lambda+\mu)}{\lambda+2\mu} \frac{3k_BT}{16\pi\kappa} k^2, \quad (1)$$

(equation 24 of Ref. 1). This is a well known result, which has been used to estimate the momentum scale below (or, with the replacement $k \to 2\pi/L$, the membrane size above) which anharmonic effects become dominant (see for instance equation 11 from Ref. 2, equation 5.2 from Ref. 9, equation 10 from Ref. 10 and equation 40 of Ref. 11). This is the analog of the Ginzburg criterion for critical phenomena. Notice that this value is obtained for a crystalline membrane in the absence of any external tension. Nobody in the theory of membranes has ever claimed, to our knowledge, that this term should be just neglected, in virtue of the condition of zero surface tension. At $T = 0$, we have the term with the same k-dependence. The only difference is that at $T = 0$ it depends on the cut-off. We do not believe that this difference has any meaning, if we do not postulate that all condensed matter theories should be renormalizable in a quantum field theory sense. We are dealing with the theory of anharmonic phonons[12] (for a recent presentation, see Ref. 13), and from the very beginning all summations on the momenta are restricted by the Brillouin zone. "Inapplicability" of the continuum medium theory in this situation means that when using the Debye model for the phonons we are not guaranteed that the numerical factor is correct (actually, it is not), but this not a reason to say that this factor should be zero.

Moreover, the condition of zero tension in two dimensions is equivalent to the condition of zero pressure in three dimensions, and in the latter case it is well known how to deal with this condition. When considering thermal expansion in theory of crystals, one needs first to calculate the phonon contribution to the pressure; nobody has ever put this correction to zero but use it to calculate the change of the equilibrium lattice parameter induced by this pressure[13]. This is exactly how we use this k^2 term, to find the analog of the Ginzburg criterion and to calculate the contribution to the thermal expansion.

III. COMPARISON OF PHYS. REV. B 89, 125433 (2014) WITH OUR WORK

In Phys. Rev. B 89, 125433 (2014)[5], the authors perform a Wilsonian perturbative renormalization calculation, where fluctuations are integrated out step-by-step starting from large momentum fluctuations and going towards small momentum fluctuations. This is to be contrasted with the approach of our own work Ref. 1, where the in-plane modes are integrated once and for all momenta, and we are left with an effective theory for the out-of-plane modes. Nevertheless, we will try to show the correspondence between the two approaches.

Let us start with the standard stretching energy term for the crystalline membrane

$$\mathcal{U}_{\text{strech}} = \frac{1}{2}\epsilon_{ij} c^{ijkl} \epsilon_{kl}, \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon_{ij} = \left(\partial_i u_j + \partial_j u_i + \partial_i h \partial_j h\right)/2$ is the relevant strain tensor and $c^{ijkl} = \lambda\delta^{ij}\delta^{kl} + \mu\left(\delta^{ik}\delta^{jl} + \delta^{il}\delta^{jk}\right)$ is the elastic moduli tensor for an isotropic membrane. The stretching energy contains the usual quadratic term for the in-plane displacements, $\partial_i u_j c^{ijkl} \partial_k u_l/2$; a cubic term between in-plane and out-of-plane displacements, $c^{ijkl}\left(\partial_i u_j\right)\left(\partial_l h \partial_k h\right)/2$, which we represent diagrammatically as in Figure 1(a); and a quartic term for out-of-plane displacements, $c^{ijkl}\left(\partial_i h \partial_j h\right)\left(\partial_l h \partial_k h\right)/8$, which we represent diagrammatically in Figure 1(b).

In a Wilsonian renormalization approach, fields are split between slow fields (with momenta from 0 up to Λ'), which we will denote by u_S and h_S, and fast fields (with momenta between $\Lambda'$and Λ), which we will denote as u_F and h_F. When writing the in-plane strain in Fourier modes one has to treat the homogeneous component separately, such that we have

$$\partial_i u_j\left(\vec{x},\tau\right) = u^0_{ij} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{\beta V}} \sum_{iq_n,\vec{q}\neq 0} iq_i u_j\left(\vec{q},iq_n\right) e^{i\vec{q}\cdot\vec{x}} e^{-iq_n\tau}, \quad (3)$$

where u^0_{ij} is the homogeneous strain component term. Therefore, u^0_{ij} is always a slow variable. After integrating out the fast variables, the partition function can be written as

$$Z = \int D\left[u_S, h_S, u_F, h_F\right] e^{-S_\Lambda\left[u_S,h_S,u_F,h_F\right]}$$
$$= \int D\left[u_S, h_S\right] e^{-S_{\Lambda'}\left[u_S,h_S\right]}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$e^{-S_{\Lambda'}\left[u_S,h_S\right]} = \int D\left[u_F, h_F\right] e^{-S_\Lambda\left[u_S,h_S,u_F,h_F\right]}. \quad (5)$$

When integrating out the fast modes, the interaction pictured in Figure 1(a) will generate, at one loop, a linear term for u^0_{ij} of the form of Figure 2, which can be written as

$$\Delta S^{(0)}_{\Lambda'}\left[u_S\right] = \tau^{ij} \int_0^\beta d\tau \int d^2x \partial_i u_j, \quad (6)$$

with

$$\tau^{ij} = \frac{1}{2}\left(\lambda+\mu\right)\frac{1}{\beta V} \sum_{ip_n,\vec{p},\Lambda'<|\vec{p}|<\Lambda} p^2 \left\langle h_{\boldsymbol{p}} h_{-\boldsymbol{p}}\right\rangle_0. \quad (7)$$

τ^{ij} seems to act like an externally applied stress/tension.



FIG. 2. Diagram that contributes to the generation of a linear term in $\partial_i u_j$. The F subscript means that the loop involves fast modes.

Recall that an in-plane (stretching) stress, σ^{ij}, couples to the in-plane strain as a term in the potential energy of the form $-\partial_i u_j \sigma^{ij}$. This linear term can be eliminated by making a shift in the fields, $\partial_i u_j \to \partial_i u_j - c^{ijkl}\sigma_{kl}$, at the cost of generating a term of the form $\sigma^{ij}\partial_i h \partial_j h/2$. Such a term indeed gives origin to a k^2 term in the self-energy of the out-of-plane displacement field.

However, τ^{ij} is not a real stress. To see this, one must notice that besides generating $\Delta S^{(0)}_{\Lambda'}[u_S]$, one will also generate a quadratic term for the out-of-plane mode, see Figure 3(a), which is exactly given by

$$\Delta S^{(1)}_{\Lambda'}[h_S] = \frac{1}{2}\tau^{ij}\int_0^\beta d\tau \int d^2x \partial_i h \partial_j h. \tag{8}$$

Therefore, collecting $\Delta S^{(0)}_{\Lambda'}[u_S]$ and $\Delta S^{(1)}_{\Lambda'}[u_S]$ one obtains

$$\Delta S^{(0)}_{\Lambda'}[u_S] + \Delta S^{(1)}_{\Lambda'}[h_S] = \\ = \int_0^\beta d\tau \int d^2x \tau^{ij}\left(\partial_i u_j + \frac{1}{2}\partial_i h \partial_j h\right). \tag{9}$$

Such a term, indeed does not give origin to a k^2 term in the out-of-plane phonon self-energy. To see this, notice that the term $\tau^{ij}\partial_i u_j$ can be eliminated by performing a shift in the fields, $\partial_i u_j \to \partial_i u_j - c^{ijkl}\tau_{kl}$, at the expense of generating a new term, $-\tau^{ij}\partial_i h \partial_j h/2$. This new term, will exactly cancel the term in $\Delta S^{(1)}_{\Lambda'}[h_S]$. Therefore, the dispersion relation of the flexural phonon is left unchanged by the diagram from Figure 3(a). In the approach employed in our work, Ref. 1, this fact manifests itself by the non-existence of Hartree/tadpole diagrams in our perturbative calculation (the diagrams from Figure 3(a) and (b) exactly cancel). Furthermore, notice that in a Wilsonian renormalization calculation, the diagram from Figure 3(b) never occurs since, by momentum conservation, the in-plane mode line necessarily carries zero momentum and therefore is not a fast variable.

However, besides generating the term $\Delta S^{(1)}_{\Lambda'}[h_S]$, two more terms are generated at one loop, that are quadratic in the out-of-plane displacement. These two terms are represented by the diagrams in Figure 4(a) and (b).



FIG. 3. Tadpole/Hartree diagrams that contribute to the correction of the out-of-plane quartic term. The diagram (b) does not contribute when performing a Wilsonian renormalization calculation.

These are the diagrams that we consider in our perturbative calculation in Ref. 1, and are also the ones that are considered in the classical theory of crystalline membranes of Nelson & Peliti[2]. Contrary to the diagram of Figure 3(a), these diagrams do not have a partner diagram giving origin to a linear term in $\partial_i u_j$, and therefore, cannot be eliminated with a shift of $\partial_i u_j$. Therefore, the diagrams from Figure 4(a) and (b) will be responsible for a correction to the membrane bending rigidity.

In our work Ref. 1, we found out that the diagrams from Figure 4(a) and (b) lead to a change of the bending rigidity $\kappa \sim k^{-\eta}$, and have found that $\eta = 2$ at perturbative level, just like in the classical theory[2]. The difference with respect to the classical case, is that while in the classical theory a self-consistent calculation (neglecting the correction to the in-plane elastic constants) changes this value from $\eta = 2$ to $\eta = 1$[2], in our zero temperature calculation, the $\eta = 2$ value remained unchanged when doing a similar calculation.

Notice that Kats and Lebedev acknowledge in Ref. 5 that the diagrams of the form of Figure 4(a) and (b) lead to k^2 contributions to the self-energy of the out-of-plane mode that will be UV (ultraviolet) divergent, as we have found in Ref. 1. Kats and Lebedev argue that such a k^2 term is a tension and therefore should be forced to be zero, since a free membrane has zero tension. However, in order to make such a term zero, one would have to add to the bare action an in-plane tension term that would act as a counter term. One should notice, that differently from what is done in renormalized perturbation theory, in a Wilsonian renormalization calculation no contour terms are added to the bare action. Furthermore, since



FIG. 4. Sunset/Fock diagrams that contribute to the renormalization of the bending rigidity of the membrane.

the k^2 term also appears in the classical theory, we do not see any reason why we should add such an in-plane tension term to the theory and instead take the k^2 term as a result of the model, which we interpret to be renormalization of the bending rigidity of the membrane.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we insist that the k^2 term in the self-energy of the out-of-plane mode is not a tension term, but a momentum dependent correction to the bending rigidity of the membrane. A k^2 term is also found at perturbative level in the classical theory of membranes[2]. Therefore, such a term should not be forced to be zero. We should emphasize, however, that the discussion on this note concerns only a perturbative calculation, which is the approach used both in our work Ref. 1 and by Kats and Lebedev in Ref. 5. We know that in the classical theory a complete understanding of the physics of membranes requires a non-perturbative treatment of interactions[8]. Such a non-perturbative treatment will also be necessary in the quantum case.

Furthermore, the use of a high momentum cutoff, and its identification with the Debye momentum, allows us to estimate the contribution from high momentum modes and is enough to make the kind of estimations we do in our paper Ref. 1. Therefore, we consider the criticisms made by Kats and Lebedev to be unjustified.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

B.A. acknowledges support from Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (Portugal), through Grant. No. SFRH/BD/78987/2011. R.R. acknowledges financial support from the Juan de la Cierva Programe (MEC, Spain). E.C. acknowledges support from the European project FP7-PEOPLE-2013-CIG "LSIE_2D" and Italian National MIUR Prin project 20105ZZTSE. R.R. and F.G. thank financial support from MINECO, Spain, through Grant No. FIS2011-23713. M.I.K and A.F. acknowledge funding from the European Union Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement n604391 Graphene Flagship.

* Electronic address: amorim.bac@icmm.csic.es
† Electronic address: rroldan@icmm.csic.es

[1] B. Amorim, R. Roldán, E. Cappelluti, A. Fasolino, F. Guinea, and M. I. Katsnelson, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 224307 (2014).
[2] D. Nelson and L. Peliti, J. Phys. (Paris) **48**, 1085 (1987).
[3] L. Landau and E. Lifshitz, *Course of Theoretical Physics vol. 7: "Theory of Elasticity"* (Pergamon Press, Oxford, 1959).
[4] E. I. Kats and V. V. Lebedev, ArXiv e-prints (2014), arXiv:1407.4298 [cond-mat.stat-mech].
[5] E. I. Kats and V. V. Lebedev, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 125433 (2014).
[6] A. Fasolino, J. Los, and M. I. Katsnelson, Nature materials **6**, 858 (2007).
[7] K. V. Zakharchenko, M. I. Katsnelson, and A. Fasolino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 046808 (2009).
[8] D. Nelson, T. Piran, and S. Weinberg, eds., *Statistical Mechanics of Membranes and Surfaces* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2004).
[9] X. Xing, R. Mukhopadhyay, T. C. Lubensky, and L. Radzihovsky, Phys. Rev. E **68**, 021108 (2003).
[10] F. L. Braghin and N. Hasselmann, Phys. Rev. B **82**, 035407 (2010).
[11] N. Hasselmann and F. L. Braghin, Phys. Rev. E **83**, 031137 (2011).
[12] R. A. Cowley, Adv. Phys. **12**, 421 (1963).
[13] M. I. Katsnelson and A. V. Trefilov, *Dynamics and Thermodynamics of Crystal Lattices* (Atomizdat, Moscow, 2002).